

### **REMARKS**

Applicant hereby further responds to the Office Action of October 17, 2007 and the Advisory Action of December 21, 2007, in the above-referenced patent application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the application, for allowing claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 35, 36, 38 and 40, and for indicating that claims 3 and 23 contain allowable subject matter.

#### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1, 3-21 and 23-40 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claims 3 and 23 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 1, 4-14, 17, 19, 21, 24-34, 37 and 39 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 15, 18, 20, 21, 35, 38, and 40 are independent. Claims 3, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 35, 36, 38 and 40 remain.

Claims 1, 4-11, 21 and 24-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,424,749 ("Zhu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,327,257 ("Hrytzak"). Claims 12-14 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu in view of Hrytzak, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 20020067862 ("Kim").

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion in the Final Office Action mailed on October 17, 2007 (Final Office Action), that claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 35, 36, 38 and 40 are allowed. Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion in the Final Office Action that claims 3 and 23 are deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. By way of this reply, claims 3 and 23 have been rewritten in independent form, and thus are in condition for allowance.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*Claims 1, 4-11, 21 and 24-31*

Applicant traverses the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1, 4-11, 21 and 24-31 as neither Zhu, Hrytzak, either separately or in combination teach, disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicant, however, has canceled claims 1, 4-11, 21 and 24-31 with prejudice to expedite issuance. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of claims 1, 4-11, 21 and 24-31 are moot.

*Claims 12-14 and 32-34*

Applicant traverses the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 12-14 and 32-34 as Zhu, Hrytzak, Kim, either, separately or in combination teach, disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicant, however, has canceled claims 12-14 and 32-34 with prejudice to expedite issuance. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for claims 12-14 and 32-34 are moot.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that claims 3, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 35, 36, 38 and 40 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful to the further prosecution of this case, Applicants respectfully request that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the listed telephone number.

Please direct all correspondence to **Myers, Dawes Andras & Sherman, LLP**,  
19900 MacArthur Blvd., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Irvine, California 92612.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan 17, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Zarrabian, Reg. No. 39,886  
Myers Dawes Andras & Sherman, LLP  
19900 MacArthur Blvd., 11th Floor  
Irvine, CA 92612  
(949) 223-9600  
(949) 223-9610 – Fax  
Customer No.: 23386